(3)

CHAMP

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition No. 3029/2003.

PETITIONER : Sudeshwar Tiwari S/o Shri Ram Prasad Tiwari, aged about 38 years, Ex - Secretary, Village Panchayat Sitaram Pur, Tah. Pal, Distt. Surguja (C.G.) Village & Post. Balrampur, Tahsil Pal, Distt. Surguja (C.G.).

P.R. No. 3691/03
Presented by Shri A.N. Pandey
dated 19.09.03

- Versus-

RESPONDENTS : 1. State of !Chhattisgarh Through : The Secretaryk Panchayat & Social Welfare Department, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.).

RECEIVED COPY
19.9.
CLERK TO A.G. BILASPUR

2. The Collector, Surguja (C.G.)
3. Dy.Director, Panchayat & Welfare Department, Ambikapur, Distt. Surguja (C.G.)
4. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Balrampur, Tah. - Pal Distt. Surguja (C.G.).
5. Chief Executive Officer, Jila Panchayat, Ambikapur, Distt.Surguja (C.G.).
6. Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat, Sitarampur Janpad Panchayat, Balrampur, Tah. Pal, Distt. Surguja (C.G.).

उप आयुक्त एल.के शुक्ला बिलासपुर संभाग बिलासपुर (म.प्र.)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF CONSTITUTION OF INDIA :

XI-HC-22

(48)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.No. 3029/2003 **सन्** **200**

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	21.09.2006 No one appears for the petitioner, when the matter is called out. Shri Arun Sao, Govt. Advocate for the State/respondents No. 1, 2 & 3. Shri Alok Bakshi, counsel for respondents No. 4 & 5. None for respondent No. 6. Shri Arun Sao and Shri Alok Bakshi submit that this petition was filed for payment of remuneration of the petitioner due from November 1997 to July 2001 amounting to Rs. 40,000/-. They take me to the preliminary return filed on behalf of respondents No. 4 & 5 and the Annexure-R-4/1 annexed to the said return, which would show that in lieu of the remuneration of the aforesaid period, an amount of Rs. 40,501/- has already been paid to the petitioner and the petitioner has executed an acknowledgement to the said effect (Annexure-R4/1). Be that as it may, for the present, since nobody has caused appearance on behalf for the petitioner, this Court is left with no other way except to dismiss the petition for want of prosecution. The petition is dismissed for want of prosecution. **Sd/-** **Sunil Kumar Sinha** **Judge**	

Vatti.